SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, we should not ' only extend moral support but material support also, more than what it is today.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDAR MOHA- I PA TRA: Sir, wiH I be right if I say that our Foreign Minister should write to the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua, Mr. D'Escoto, that the Rajya Sabha has unanimously, irrespective of the parties, has extended its full support.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister has accepted the suggestion.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, the unanimous sentiments of this House should be conveyed to the Nicaraguan people and the Niearaguan Government in full, a's well as our total disapproval of the American policy in the case of Nicaragua.

Half-an-hour discussion on points apising out of the answer to Starred Question No, 5 given on 21st February. 1986 regarding Telugu Ganga Project

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh); Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, on February 21, 1986 While answering Starred Question No. 5 by Professor Lakshmanna, the Minister of Water Resources left many things unanswered. There was also a deliberate attempt to confuse the whole issue which, I am afraid, would only aggravate the situation and hampeir the priogress of, the Telugu-Ganga project.

Sir, the Bachawat Commission's report regarding sharing of the Krishna waters is very clear and there is 110 ambiguity in any respect and whatever objections other riparian States are raising today, they were raised before the Commission itself and the Commission gave very categorical verdict on all the points raised. It ig unfortunate that those are being repeated today, and the Union Government instead of clarifying the issues and giving clearance to the project has only added to the confusion and the controversy. I would, therefore, like to clarify certain issues involved in this matter.

The Krishna Waters Dispute Tribuanl pronounced award in 1973 and 1976 after hearing the viewpoints <*yi* all the States concerned and the Gov • ernment of India also participated in the. ' discussions. The Commission allocated the Krishna waters on the basis of 75 per cent dependability. Taking the availability of water? at 2060 TMC. They allocated the water as follows:

800 TMC for Andhra Pradesh, 700 TMC for Karnataka, 560 TMC for Maharashtra.

The Tribunal also laid down unmistakenly that Andhra Pradesh will have the liberty to use all the remaining flow in the Krishna river. Of course, they put a proviso that by doing so Andhra Pradesh would not acquire any right over the utilisation of surplus waters. This has been mentioned in clause 5(c) ef the award. In its further report, in clause 15, the Commission has clarified and stated:

"Nothing in the order of this Tribunal shall impair the right of Andhra Pradesh or any other State to regulate the water to enjoy the benefits of their rights within the State in a manner not inconsistent with the orders of this Tribunal."

This fhey have clearly stated. At the same time, they have put a restriction on the upper riparian States of Maharashtra and Karnataka in these words: They said in Chapter 14 "We restrain the States of Maharashtra and Mysore from using more water than that which is allocated to each of them. We permit the State of Andhra Pradesh to use the remaining water but we lay down, by such use the State of Andhra Pradesh shall not acquire any right *to* use the waters of the river Krishna except to

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

the extent allocated to it. In making allocation to the three States in this manner we do not expressly provide for the share of deficiency but we may mention that we have taken note of the fact that out of IOO years there may occur deficiencies in 25 yeans and m these 25 years the State of Andhra Pradesh is likely to ■uffer more than ths States of Maharashtra and Mysore."

Sir, the Karnataka Government ac that time also raised three objections before the Commission. (1) that Ihe liberty given to Andhra Pradesh to use the remaining water in excess of allocations made to it under clause 5(c) is limited to the existing carry-over capacity as found by the Tribu- j nal to meet the deficiency in the deficit areas;

(2) that Liberty given to Andhra Pradesh to utilise surplus waters be restricted to utilise within the basin; ] and

(3) that the liberty given to Andhra Pradesh for t'ne utilisation of surplus waters does not confer rights on Andhra Pradesh either to divert water outside the basin in excess of its allocation, or to construct new works for 'utilisation outside tin- basin, except with prior consent of the upper States.

On this the Commission gave the •following clarification: "There is no ground for limiting the use of the remaining water by Andhra Pradesh to its existing carry-over capacity. If the remaining water is not used by Andhra Pradesh, it will be wasted to the sea. And at pages 109—-411, Vol. II of the report, we had given full reasons for not imposing any restriction on Andha Padesh regarding flivesion of water outside the Krishna *asin. We see no ground for further • clarifying this matter.*'

Sir that is the award and the clarification by the Bachawat C^TM^IS" ,*ion on this issue. Therefore, there is no ambiguity and Andhra Pradesh is executing this project completely within the recommendations of the Bachawat Commission, it is such a laudable project. It not only intends to supply 15TMC of water to the parched city of Madras but . also irrigate on the way 2.75 lakh acres in a very drought-prone area—the Rayalaseema area. But unfortunately it has got bogged down in a controversy ra- . ised on illogical considerations and insufficient information.

Sir, the other point to be considered is whether the Andhra Pradesh Government has done anything surreptitiously without the knowledge of t'ne other States, either at the commencement of this project or earlier or later. Sir, you will be interested to know that in May, 1983 there was a function in Madras for the inauguration of the Telugu-Ganga Project and for handing over the first cheque of Rs. 30 crores by the Tamil Nadu Government to the Andhra Pradesh Government. A souvenir was distributed by the Tamil Nadu Government, a copy of which I place on the Table of the House. In that it is clearly mentioned _ while explaining the scope of the project, that this canal is meant for Irritating to the extent of 2.76 iakh acres in the Rayalaseema region and also for conveying 15TMC of water intended for Madras. An illuminated map was also placed at the site of the function and the then Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, pressed a button to illuminate the map of the project. There it was clearly mentioned, both in the brochure and in the map. the project in volumes *h* irrigation content a3 well a3 the water supply to Madras city. I place this on the Table of the House.

The Hindi! of Madras dated Thursday. May 26. 1933 has as its main heading "Telugu Ganga a symbol of National Unity—PM" and in this also she clearly lauded t'ne project It contains a photograph of the Chief

Ministers of all the four States involved—the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, the Chief Minister of Karnataka, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, in addition to the Prime Min. ister and the Governor of Tamil Nadu. All ivere present at the function. Brochures were distributed to them and all were witnesses to the function on that day. I placed this copy also-on the Table of the House. The Andhra Pradesh Government also brought out a souvenir on the occasion of the inauguration of t'ne work with a map showing the scope of the new Telugu-Ganga Project. It also contained two messages—one from the President of India which I would not like co quote as I do not want to drag him into the controversy and the other was a message from the then Union Minister of Irri. gation, Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha, which says;

> "We are very happy to know that Chief Ministers of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh will be lying the foundation stone for Telugu-Ganga Project on 27-4-83, being taken up consequent to the agreement between the two States for providing water for Madras city and irrigation io drought prone areas in the districts of Rayalaseema and Nellore.
>
> Heartiest good wishes on this auspicious occasion of starting of the work for the Telugu.Ganga Project."

This is a message given on tne occasion of starting of work on the Telugu Ganga project on April 27, 1983. I place this also on the Table of the House.

It is, therefore, very clear to all the Chief Ministers and all the States were aware of the project^ its extent and that it contained both irrigaion content and supply of water to Madras city. Therefore, today if anybody says that he was not aware, it is not correct. It can at best be an afterthought.

One more point I would like to mention 'here. Andhra Pradeh does not want to prosper a. the cost of others. We are equally interested in the welfare of Karnataka, in the welfare of Tamil Nadu, in'the welfare of Maharashtra. We take a nationalistic view of these things and we do not want to starve anybody or rob anybody of their legitimate share. Maharashtra and Karnataka have been allocated specific quantities of water—700 TMC and 560 TMC. They are at liberty to use it; nobody stops them. And they are upper riparian States. The river flows from Maharashtra to Karnataka and then comes • to Andhra Pradesh in the last and if they use the water fully, as far as I3 allocated to them, we will be able to use only whatever is left to us. The river fe not flowing towards Karnataka and Maharashtra from Andhra. Therefore, there is no question of our robbing any State of its legitimate share. This is also a fallacy which should be kept in mind.

Sir there is also a doubt expressed whether there is enough water in the river to sustain this project. This also has been clarified more than once to the Central Water Commission and the Planning Commission also. Continuous gauging is being done at Jorala, Srisailam, Nagarjun Sagar and Vijayawada and we are convinced and we also convinced the officials of the Union Government that there is 330 TMC of water which is going int© the sea . Andhra Pradesh is going to use only 29TMC, not even 10 per cent of the water which ic going waste into the sea.

We are thinking of a national water policy. The Prime Minister has taken, the initiative. The Minister for Water Resources a'so convened *n* meeting of the Chief Ministers. We take a realistic and nationalist[1]"? view welcome their initiatives. Let us

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

of these things. If water is going io waste, who is going to be benefited by tfiat? I can also submit that Andhra Pradesh today is surplus in food-grains. Andhra does not need anything more to feed its people. Whatever additional foodgrains that are produced in Andhra Pradesh will go to the nation, to the people of the country. Therefore, we are not selfish in that respect and we are not executing the project only to feed ourselves. For example, Andhra is surplus in electricity. Today we are sharing it with Tamil Nadu, we are (sharing with Karnataka and other States also. Therefore, when we are thinking on the lines of a national water policy and if we are going to take a national outlook, why should we quarrel over petty things? No body is stopping Karnataka and Ma. harashtra from executing their projects. Why are They not doing it? We will use only whatever is left. Let them complete tneir projects, let them execute more projects within he Bachawat Commission's recommendations. Therefore, we are cot selfish in that -espect also. Sir, this project is already being executed. Already Rs. IOO crores have been spent including Rs. 47 crores contributed by the Tamil Nadu Government. In the next year's Plan wc have allocate'! Rs. 75 crores. Is there any meanm? Sn saying "You don't go ahead with this project" or "We would delay the clearance?'* While wt.rk on the project is going on, the Centre says. *'*!.* won't clear, I won't clear." There is no meaning. They have to clear it hecause we are within our right to execute this project. There is doubt about it.

Sir, I strongly plead that as far as the inter-State matter are concerned, we feel there is no dispute. Matters are very clear. The Commission's award is very clear and here is no dispute as far as are concerned. But, even « trie Central Government feels that there are some differences as I told Mr. Shankaranand last time dur. ing the Question Hour, it is his duxy. it is the duty of the Prime Minister, it is the duty of the Union Government to clarify matttrs. When two or three States are taking a different view, it is the Centres responsibility to clarify and give clearance to the project. But they are not doing it. However, I am very happy Io see what Mr. Hegde said recently He said in Bangalore on February 27. I quote:

> "Mr. Hegde however made it clear that Karnataka could not prevent Andhra Pradesh from goi: ahead with the Telugu Ganga Project as long as it did not violate the Bachawat Tribunal Award."

This is from the "INDIAN EXPRESS", Sir. The "DECCAN HERALD" of Bangalore also quoted him. and it says:

"The Award had o provision for Andhra Pradesh using now excess of water in the river instead of allowing it to flow into the sea. But this would not enable Andhra Pradesh to stake its claim over the surplus water for ever, Mr. Hegde says."

What he is saying and what we are saying *fa* the same. Where is the difference? Where is the confusion"' Why should there be a delay in clearing this Project? Therefore, Sir, 1 need not dilate much on this matter. Everybody is aware of the facts. 1 only request the Union Government and the Minister of Water Resource? to take an early action to clear thr, Project so that no further controversies will be there and that this cont roversy is not prolonged.

And one thing 1 want to tell him. Last time in his reply he said.. .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SITARAM KESRI): You cross the Telugu Ganga.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA; Last time the Minister sail that a number of clarincatiorjj wer; awaited from the Andhra Prades'a Government. It is not correct. Then also I contradicted him. All the clarifications asked for have been given by the Andhra Pradesh Governmeni; nothing is pending either in regard to the hydrological aspects or the ecological and environmental and forestry aspect^ or the inter-State aspects. All the 21 sets of comments raised by the Central Water Commission have been replied to; nothing is pending with the Andhra Pradesh Government. If you want any more clarification, thei officers can come any time to clarify the matter. But he should not take more time. It fe high time that he cleared the Project and allowed it to go ahead.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; If the Minister wants to make a Statment ■*now...*

AN HON. MEMBER: No. no.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: O.K. One by one I will call the names for asking questions. Please confine Io questions alone because we are already running 'short of time.

Shri Hanumanthappa.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while accepting ihe argument of my learned friend, Mr. Upendra, to the extent of the Bachawat Award, the Krishna Watery Dispute Tribunal Award. I want to lemind how he got 800 TMC of water. What is the portion of Karnataka. what is the portion of Maharashtra and what is the portion of Andhra Pradesh and the catchment area cf Krishna? Maharashtra has 26,805 sq. rr.'les; Karnataka ha.s 43,734 sq. miles: Andhra Pradesh has 29,441 sq. miles. About the catchment area, 45 per cent is from Karnataka, 26 per cont is from Maha-rashtra, and Andhra Pradesh has got or.lv 29 per eenr But Andhra Prakesh gets the maior share, 800 TMC of water; Karnataka gets 700 TMC of water, which should have got 1030 TMC of water; and Maharashtra gets only 560 TMC of water. This is also because Andhra Pradesh has started its projects. Because Andhra Pra. desh has started its projects and the projects could not be stopped in the middle, the then 1951 Commission awarded taking into 'consideration the on-going projects, in order not to stop the projects. That is how Andhra gained more wateis from the Krishna basin than it was entitled to.

Sir, here we see the same game now by starting the Telugu Ganga Project where they have no right. I certainly agree with Mr. Upendra when he says that the Tribunal had however given *to* Andhra Pradesh the liberty of using any water here the remaining water that may be flowing into the River Krishna. Yes, to that extent all the States are a party, and the Union Government is also a party.

SHR' PARVATHANENl UPENDRA; Nor going into the sea?

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I am coming Io il. about going to the sea.

SHRI SITARAM KESRfc Sea or ocean?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Sea is a part of it.

. SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA: But thereby it shall not acquire any right whatsoever to using any water here nor shall it be deemed to have been allocated in any water year water of Krishna in excels of the quantity specified. Here comes the dispute. By spending Rs. 637 crores, taking 11.150 cusecs of water, are you goiag to stop it once the question of re-allocation comes, when Ihe whole Bachawat Commission Award is reviewed at 2,000 A.D.? According to the Bachawat Award this arrangement will continue up to 2,000 A.D. and Andhra has a right to utilise the water which goes to the sea and the whole thing will have to be reviewed after 2,000 A.D. If my friend, Shri Upendra, agrees to stop the whote thing on 2,000 A.D., then he has got every right to utilise the existing water which goes to the sea. But the people from Kar-

aataka, the riparian State, have got a doubt. He questions why the people from the Riparian State have put forward this question? We accepted that because we never wanted to stop your Nagarjuna Sagar Project. Without the consent of the Central Government, without hearing to our objections, you erected the crust gate in Nagarjuna Sagar thereby robbing, if I use the word, waters of the riparian States. Here I say a deliberate attempt of the Andhra Pradesh, much to the. sugarcoated wordings of Shrj Upendra, is for denying us of our right in the waters. We have no right to-day sitting in the Parliament to block the future of our future generation. That is where .1 object to the Telugu-Ganga Project. By taking more waters you cannot block the future of the Karnataka and the Maharashtra States. May be we might have not utilised the water today, but why our children should not utilise that water? We have equally got drought areas. Major portion in Krishna basin is suffering from drought today. People are going in search of food, fodder in Maharashtra and Goa also.

My hon. friend has made much about the message of the then Irrigation Minister, Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha. The very first sentence of the message says:

"In pursuance of the Agreement arrived at by the States_____ "

That is only a message. By sending a message no Minister will refer to the files seeing what was the agreement etc. For the benefit of my hon. friend, Shri Upendra, I wiH just go through the Agreement. What were the conditions. They have now linked 15 TMC of water to Maharashtra. What was the Agreement of 28th October, 1977? I quote:

"The Government of Tamil Nadu shall be permitted to draw not more than 15 TMC in a water year from Srisailam Reservoir during the period from 1st July to 31st October through an open line channel from Srisailam to Pennar.....

From this it is the Tamil Nadu Government which has to draw water and not the Telugu Desam Government of Andhra.

"----- designed to carry a discharge not exceeding 1500 cusecs...."

This is the first portion. What is the respossibility of the Government of Andhra Pradesh under this Agreement?

"The Government of Andhra Pradesh will cooperate in the acquisition of land in providing necessary storage. Andhra Pradesh will also provide facilities in the construction of canals and other/ structures and also for the maintenance and operation of the water supply system."

This is all the responsibility of Andhra while drawing the water to Tamil Nadu.

"Tamil Nadu shall bear the cost of the arrangements for conveying of water from Srisailam to Poondy and will bear the maintenance and operational charges."

It is where Mrs. Gandhi came into picture on the day of inauguration. She was present and she witnessed the handing-over of.Rs. 30 crore draft from Shri M. G. Ramachandran to Shri N. T. Rama Rao.

The Clause (iv) is very important.

"The lined channel between Srisailam and Samasila from the point of off-take to be agreed upon by Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu shall not be utilised for irrigation or other consumptive purposes."

Here is our grievance. Andha Pradesh . has violated this conditon to which Andhra is a party, Tamil Nadu is a Party, Karnataka and Maharashtra are also parties.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Can I interrupt you for a minute? Just one minute only. The restriction of water not being used for irrigation relates to the 15 TMC of water. They said that while carrying this 15 TMC of water to Madras City we should not use it for

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

irrigation purposes. That was the restriction. This restriction was not for the surplus water.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Anyway thank you for your clarification. Your channel should be carry water of only 15 TMC. That is also an agreement. I do not know what answer Mr. Upendra has got. Why the channel of 11,150 TMC of water? The agreement clearly says that 1,500 cusecs of water is only to be drawn. *{Interruptions)*

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will make only one point. I will take only one minute.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: This agreement is subject to formal ratification by the respective States which is given in the last sentence of the agreement. In response to this, the Andhra Pradesh Government while ratifying it sent a letter to the Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation. In the agreement the Minister of Major Irrigaiton and Commercial Taxes, Government of Andhra Prdaesh has also signed. I will read out what was rectification given by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. *(Interruptions* -------- )

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: When I am having a copy of the agreement, I knew the contents of the last para. Yon need not read out the last para.

MR. DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Prof. Lakshmanna, I will give you time. Let him speak.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, I am having a copy of the agreement and I know what are the contents of the last para.

I am a party to the agreement. You are a party to the agreement. I know your decency. When I am reading the agreement, does it mean that I have not gone through the last para? I know it. I know the entire correspondence.

Sir .coming to the last clause of Ihe agreement, it says, I quote:

> "The Central Government will make arrangements to inspect the. system during the operational stages and ensure that withdrawal of water into this water suppply system from Srisailam does not exceed 15 TMC of water in a year. And that system is to be utilised only for water supply to the Madras City, but not for any other purpose."

Sir, the responsibility of the Central Government comes here. If it is a project to draw water for drinking purpose to the Tamil Nadu, the powers of each State ar© confined. It is stated that Tamil Nadu cannot withdraw more than 15 TMC with. 1,500 cusec channel. The Government of Andhra Pradesh has to acquire the land and assist in constructing the project. This water should not be used for irrigation purposes and the Central Government has to oversee that all the points of tbe agreement are followed by all the parties to this agreement.

Sir, now the doubt arises about the Telugu Ganga Project.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I wiH give only facts.

Now, the doubt arises in the minds of the Karnataka people. I agree that you are entitled for your share. I fully support what Mr Hegde has said that within the Bachawat Award you have got every right to utilise the water that goes to the sea. We definitely agree to it. But I want a clarification from the Government of Andhra Pradesh, having spent this much, are you going to close the channel after 2000 AD? The Government of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra know that in the Bachawat Award there is a second part which says that at 2000 years also more than 2000 TMC ft. of water which will be available, Maharashtra is entitled for 35 per cent, Karnataka 50 per cent and Andhra Pradesh only 15 per cent upto a certain limit. Thereafter Maharashtra 25 per cent, Andhra Pradesh 25 per cent and Karnataka 50 per cent. Even in future also Andhra Pradesh is not going to get that much of water. The 11,150

cuscs of water is hardly 340 TMC of water. Jf the part 'B' of the Bachawat Award [1] is implemented as notified by the Govemment, then also the Government of Andhra Pradesh is not going to get so much of water. On the other hand, the Karnataka State has "to get 350 TMC from the surplus water that will be seviewed at that lime.

So, in view of these things, Karnataka and Maharashtra have got every right to object and both the States have objected to this project which is contrary to the Bachawat Award as well as the agreement of 197 and 1977. So now I want certain clarifications about this Telugu-Ganga Project. Why does it have such a large capacity of 11,150 vusecs when a capacity of only !,500 eusecs has been provided in the agreement. And the area propsed to be irrigated is 3.5 lakh acres. We are not against Andhra Pradesh trying to provide irrigation to their drought-hit areas, but, as my friend has said, not at the cost of the neighbouring States and the riparian States.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: They should stick *to* that. We certainly agree that if Andhra produces more, it goes to the national wealth. We agree that water is a national property. If Andhra flouri-. we have no heart-burning. Let Andhra also flourish. But, at the same time, we have no right to block the future generations. This is where we are worried, the Maharashtra people and the Karnataka people.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We are not stopping you about the 700 TMC.

SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Mr. Upendra, if you cannot build a house today, it does not mean that your son also will not build. At least keep the site. If your resources cannot allow you to build a house, at least your son may have the resources to construct a house. Maybe we are at fault, we have not utilised it...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I am sorry. I have no hesitation in accepting that we have not utilised that water, but at the same time, we have no right to sell away our rights to a person who is using it. If we cannot take up the projects *iO*-day for various reasons, it does not mean that the future generation or the next Government will not take up those projects. They may find the resources. We have no authority to block them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am going to call the next speaker. *{Interruptions')* .

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Once water has gone to Andhra, it will not come back. That is where we are worried.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The total time for this discussion is half an hour. Already we have taken half an- hour and there are three or four more speakers.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: These things help in solving inter-State problems, in harmonising Centre-State relations. That is why I have taken more time and I beg your pardon for taking so much of your time. On these specific points, I request the Government of India to take the initiative. I certainly join Mr. Upendra: let the Central Government take the initiative to call the concerned States to sit together and, if possible, see that a solution is arrived at. We are not against it. But it must -be done early. The people of Karnataka have an apprehension that their future right is being blocked. We will be very happy if this is solved amicably between Andhra and Karnataka. After all, we are neighbouring States and we are friends. Thank you.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Sir, water is a national wealth and if the water can be utilised in any part of the country, in any State of our[1] country, it is a welcome sign. I only want to put two or three questions in this regard. The southern States seem to be. fortunate in that a tribunal was appointed and it gave its award in very clear and

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta]

cogent terras, allocating the share of each State—Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh—and all the States concurred in allowing 15 TMC of water to Tamil Nadu. To that extent, the States were very for-iimate. Now for some small, little reasons, some disputes have arisen. At least you should see to it that after such a big agreement has been reached, these waters are not allowed to go waste into the sea, giving benefit to none, because we have already suffered, I, with my personal experience, can say that we have already suffered in the North. Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan have argued over and over again and in spite of three agreements reached earlier, still the question of Ravi Beas surplus water is hanging fire. There is no tribunal, no solution. AH the Chief Ministers and the Prime Minister of India were signatories to the agreement, but no sanctity is attached even to that agreement.

Please do not make the Southern States fight over the award as you are allowing the Northern States to do. This water must be utilised properly at the earliest and it should be stopped from flowing into the sea and it should be utilised to enrich the farmers of these States. So, let them start the construction. Don't stop the projeet. Let the project proceed. Do not stop it in the middle because that will cause benefit to none. I do hope also that, while arguing the case of the Telugu Ganga Project, something would be done in the case of the Northern States also. I would request the honourable Minister to see that the water which is flowing and which- was purchased in 1960 from Pakistan for a sum of Rs. 110 crores, is also stopped from flowing into the ocean and the surplus waters of Ravi and Beas ar$_e$ well utilised by the States of Haryana. Punjab and Rajasthan, which demand is justifiably made, so that all these States prosper and nobody suffers. Thank you. Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Babul Reddy. Make it short, please.

SHRI P. BABUL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, this Telugu-Ganga Project, which was inaugurated by the late Prime Minister on 25th May, 1983, was held as aa illustrious example of inter-State co-operation. Unfortunately, much dust is kicked up over it now and now it is proving to be an example of unnecessary controversy among the three States. Now* I will tell you one thing. The figure of 2060 TMC of water was arrived at by the Bachawat Tribunal and it is based on 75 per cent dependability. They have taken these figures and they have only 75 per cent dependability and they have arrived at a figure of 2060 TMC. When this water, whose dependability is 75 per cent, was distributed, 800 TMC was allotted to Andhra Pradesh, 560 TMC was alloted to Maharashtra and 700 TMC was given to Karnataka. But my learnel colleague, Mr. Hanumanthappa, is now trying to go back on it-and, with all his eloquence, he cannot overrule the Bachawat Award and this award must be taken and from that you must proceed to make the allocation to the respective States. The Bachawat Tribunal started in 1969 and they delivered the award in 1973. ]n 1979, Karnataka wanted some clarification. One clarification they wanted was that the right of the Anlhrha Pradesh Government should be limited to use the excess water in the Krishna basin only. The second thing they wanted was that the liberty of the Andhra Pradesh Government to use the excess water should be only through the existing works and not through the new works. The tribunal rejected out of hand that petition and said that there is no need for any clarification. The Government of Andhra Pradesh is at liberty to use the water as it likes. Now we have to see the Whole thing. This unfortunate thing happened like this: In Karnataka, the Congress (I) people raised the dispute to make out a case against Shri Ramakrishna Hegde and they said that both Shri Ramakrishna Hegde and Shri Rama Rao, both names starting with 'Rama' are good friendds and that Mr. Hegde is selling away the interests of Karnataka to Andhra Pradesh. This is the impression fhey created. They created this impression so effectively that even the Hegde Government and the PWD Minister of the Hegde Government had to take a bold stand and saytliat these people were committing a breach of the very agreement, the award given by the Bachawat Tribunal. Our Chief Minister also has taken on many roles and

he took on a new role and said that no power on earth can stop this project. The noi only infuriated Karnataka, but also Maharashtra, which was sleeping over this Ior eight years. Maharashtra has gone to the extent of sayiag that even the 5 TMC which was decided upon earlier they were not agreeable to. So, now it has become a psychological war. I am only putting the point straight. Only 29 TMC of water is going to be used for irrigation purposes. Now, if there is excess water up to 2000 AD—this matter has to be in two parts under the Bachawat Award, as Mr. Upendra has rightly said, we can have an injunction against these two States from utilising this water. So far as Andhra is concerned, it is at liberty to use it- But this use will not clothe them with that right. They will not acquire any right up to 2000 AD. Up to 2000 AD they have right. Our right is up to 2000. The Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister has to say. You cannot raise it, But we give an undertaking that after 2000 AD we will not build up the right on that use but we will make our own arrangements if we do not get any excess water. As it is, 300... water is going, to sea every year. Out of that if it is re-distributed, everybody would get his share. But supposing in 2000 AD Andhra Pradesh gets excess water, it is enough. If they do not get *it,* Andhra Pradesh Government must categorically say, in my humble opinion, that they will make our own arrangements, they will divert Godavari water into Krishna, they will not ask for more than 800 TMC at any time unless excess water is alloted to them. This is how the problem can be solved. Unfortunately the Central Government, instead of seeing tbe problem which is very simple are taking pleasure and asking pie are taking pleasure and asking we will have fun out of it. So this attitude must stop. This is a very simple matter, in my humble opinion, though Rs. 800 crores is being spent. So 1500 TMC is there, 29 TMC for Rayalaseema urea, because in the Bachawat Award there is, a sptcial TeCctsace that \h«, Rayalaseema area is a drought prone area, there is a fear that Anantpur may become a desert. Our previous President belongs to thai area. Some geographical research shows that if may become a'desert if you don't give water. So tbe Central Government must play a constructive role and tell all the three States that there is nothing to quarrel about it. Karnataka should he assured that their interest is safeguarded. They can also clarify that the Govemment of Andhra Pradesh will not get any water right by mere use of it. Clarification should also he given by the Bachawat Award.

So, Sir, the Central Government, my submission is, should play a constructive role, leave off the fun and get down to business. , »

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय :** आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदया, हमारे मित्र उपेन्द्र जी ने जो प्रश्न उठाया तेलुगु–गंगा प्राजेक्ट का और कृष्णा वाटर के बंटवारे का इसके साथ ही उन्होंने अपने प्रश्न के दौरान यह भी कहा है कि सरकार को राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण को मद्देनजर रखते हुए राष्ट्रीय हितों को प्राथमिकता दे कर इसको हल करना चाहिए। यह बड़े दुख की बात है है कि आज पानी का बहुत महत्व है और आदरणीय सिंचाई मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि सतलुज, यमूना कैनाल का प्रश्न बरसों से डटकर हुआ है और पंजाब हरियाणो और राजस्थान में रावी व्यास के पानी के बटवारे का सवाल भी हमारे सामने है। करोड़ों टन अनाज जिस पानी से हो सकता था उस पानी के न मिलने के कारण वह अनाज पैदा नहीं हो पा रहा है और भिन्न-भिन्न मुख्य मंत्री अपने अपने हितों के लिए आपसी टकराव की बात कर रहे हैं। केन्द्रीय सरकार को मजबूती के साथ और कड़ाई के साथ व्यवहार करके इन समस्याओं का हल निकालना चाहिए ।

उपसभापति महोदय, कृष्णा के पानी के बटवारे का सवाल है तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि केन्द्रीय सरकार विशेष रूप से सिंचाई मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्री तीनों प्रदेशों के मुख्य मंत्रियों को दिल्ली बुला कर इस प्रश्न के हल के लिए यह क

[श्री कल्पनाथ राय]

कि एक महीने के अन्दर, दो महीने के अन्दर या तीन महीने के अन्दर, यानी एक सयम बद्ध योजना के अन्तर्गत वह पानी के बटवारे का सवाल हल कर लें । यदि वह ऐसा नहीं कर सके तो केन्द्रीय सरकार इस में दखल देगी और इस पर अपना फैसला देगी । यदि यह दृष्टि कोण केन्द्रीय सरकार नहीं अपनायेगी तो आने वाले दिनों में सभी राज्य नदी के पानी के बटवारे को लेकर आपस में ऐसा संघर्ष करेंगे कि इससे पूरे देश का भारी नुकसान होगा ।

उपसभापति महोदया सिंचाई मंत्री जी से यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि बदलती हुई परिस्थिति में जब देश में पानी और बिजली की बड़ी आवश्यकता है और पूरी हमारी भविष्य की योजनाएं पानी और बिजली के ऊपर चलने वाली हैं तो इस पानी के लिए एक नेशनल वाटर ग्रिड बनाना चाहिए और इस पानी को पूरे राष्ट्रीय साधन के रूप में स्वीकार करना चाहिए । और संविधान में अगर संशोधन भी करना हो तो वह संशोधन किया जाना चाहिए और सरकार को एक नेशनल वाटर ग्रिड बनाना चाहिए । जिस प्रदेश को, जिस कसबे को, जिस टाउन को, जिस महानगर को पानी की आवश्यकता हो उसको पानी दिया जाना चाहिए ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आदरणीय श्री उपेन्द्र जी ने जिस तरह की बातें कही हैं उनमें से कुछ बातों में मैं उनसे सहमत हूं । लेकिन वे अपने प्रदेश का हल इस पार्लियामेंट में करना चाहिए। उन्हें अपने मुख्य मंत्री पर भी कुछ नियंत्रण करना चाहिए क्योंकि मुख्यमंत्री को भी कुछ मर्यादाओं के अन्दर काम करना होता है। उन्होंने एक बात कही जो अखबारों के अन्दर भी आई है। उन्होंने कहा कि श्री शंकरानन्द को सिंचाई मंत्री रहने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है (व्यवधान)

श्री पर्वतनेनि उपेन्द्र : चीफ मिनिस्टर ने नहीं कहा मैंने कहा ।

*(interruptions.)* He did not say anything. I said it. . . *i*

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आपको भी ऐसी बात नहीं बोलनी चाहिए थी ।

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That he has already said. Don'l take up this controversy.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : यह प्रधान मंत्री को तय करना होता है कि कौन मिनिस्टर रहे और कौन न रहे । आपके मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा कि दुनिया की कोई ताकत हमको इस योजना को चलाने से नहीं रोक सकती है । उनको यह याद रखना चाहिए कि उनके बगल में कर्नाटक है; महाराष्ट्र है और अन्य प्रदेश भी हैं (व्यवधान)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: When I said that Mr. Shankaranand may divest himself of this portfolio tetnpoian!y, I did not mean any disrespect to him. Since he is politician and he comes from Karnataka, there might be some embarrassment moments for him to decide ei iier this way or that way. To get over thai difficulty, I suggested that he may hand over this issue to the Prime Minister and he himself may say that he would not deal with this issue.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Shri K. L. Rao hailed from Andhra Pradesh. When he was the Irrigation Minister, Karnataka accepted it.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आदरणीय उपसभापति जी, श्री उपेन्द्र जी बहुत ही अच्छे आदमी हैं उनको कम से कम इस तरह के शब्दों का इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहिए था । हमारे श्री शंकरानन्द जी बहुत ही जंटलमैन हैं, बहुत ही अच्छे आदमी हैं।

आप भी उनको जानते हैं । वे किसी भी संसद सदस्य की या किसी भी व्यक्ति की भावनाओं को ठेस पहुंचाना नहीं चाहते हैं। उनकी यह कोशिश होगी कि दक्षिण

भारत के राज्यों में इस पानी के बंटवारे के लिए कोई टकराव न हो। इसमें आन्ध्र प्रदेश का भी हित है और कर्नाटक का भी हित है।

अंतिम बात में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हू कि श्री शकरनन्द जी को इन प्रदेशों के मुख्य मंत्रियों की तुरन्त एक कांफ्रेंस दिल्ली में बुलानी चाहिए। एक महीने के अन्दर यह बैठक बुलाई जानी चाहिए और इस समस्या को हल किया जाना चाहिए। अगर इस समस्या के हल में कोई विलम्ब होता है तो इसका असर दूसरी समस्याओं पर भी पड़ता है। आज हमारे देश में पंजाब, हरियाणा और राजस्थान में सतलुज–यमुना कैनल को लेकर पिछले 10-15 वर्ष से टकराव चल रहा है। उसके कारण हमारे देश में करोड़ टन अनाज पैदा नहीं हो पा रहा है। इन समस्याओं के हल न होने के कारण लोगों को भारी नुकसान उठाना पड़ रहा है, किसानों को नुकसान उठाना पड़ रहा है। हमने अपनी सातवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में फ़ोडक्सन प्राडक्टिविटी और इम्प्लायमेंट की बात कही है। अगर हमारे देश में किसानों को पानी नहीं मिलेगा तो सातवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में हमने जो ये लक्ष्य रखे है उनको हम पूरा नहीं कर पाएंगे। इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री जी से और विशेष रूप से सिचाई मंत्री श्री शकरानन्द जी से मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे इन समस्याओं को हल करने के लिए पहल करें। अगर वे इन समस्याओं को हल कर पाएंगे तो पूरे दक्षिण भारत की जनता उनको शुभकामनाएं देगी, धन्यवाद देगी। इन शब्दों के साथ आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए जो टाइम दिया है उसके लिए धन्यवाद देता हूं।

•SHRI N. RAJANGAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman! Sir, the. Telugu Ganga Project is a hundred year old project. Ii has been delayed. Only from the last 20—25 years it has been taken up seriously. Recently, the Chief Ministers cf the four States,, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu promised before the ten lakh people of Tamil Nadu that they will supply drinking wa-er for them. These innocent peopl* who have trust and confidence in the Government believed their promise. They were happy with the thought that the scarcity of drinking water will not exist any more in future. But due to the delay in implementing the project the confidence of the people is deteriorating.

As Shri Reddy said it is a simple ih.ng. This problem can be solved easily. If the Centre calls on to the Chief Ministers of the concerned States and has discussions it can come to a conclusion. It can be solved if they really have any I good intentions of facilitating the people of Tamil Nadu with drinking water.

We have studied in British History about Hundred Years War. This is only a matter of drinking water for the needy. Let it not turn out into a war. If it was before independence it would have been a dilfeient issue. But now, when we enjoy the fruits of independence and have good a Centre-State relationship such problems should not arise.

At present so many people in Tamil Nadu State are suffering due to the scarcity of drinking water. So, I request the Hon. Minister through you Sir, that the discussions with the concerned State Governments should be held and they should come to a conclusion and implement '.he Project as early as possible so that tbe people of Tamil Nadu wilt be benefited. There arc always some differ-

*EngUsh translation of the original Tamil speech.

[Shri N, Rajangam]

:ncc of opinions between the States. In a democratic country. What about the co-operation between Centre and th© ] States? If there are disputes just to implement a simple scheme for drinking water then, many more major disputes may arise.

So, my humble request is that the concerned States should sit together and discuss with an intention of supplying drinking water for the people of Tamil Nadu. With these words I conclude.

Thank you.

7 P.M.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would only cover three points. Firstly, there had been a lot of discussion in the Bachawat Award as to how the distribution should take place in what was known as Scheme. A which came into existence the moment the Bachhawat Award was announced and published. And according to that, after having taken various factors into consideration, they came to the conclusion that Andhra Pradesh should have 800 TMC. Karnataka 700 TMC, Maharashtra 560 TMC. And they had gone into details as to how they arrived at 800 TMC and $_A$ de rot want to go into these details because the Members know it and everybody knows it. Then, secondly, S'r, the stains of what was known as the Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal, otherwise known as Ihe Bachhawat Award is that of ihe Supreme Court, the decision is binding on all tbe parties till 31st May, 2,000 AD. After that, there may be a review. There fore, what has been given to each one of these States and what has been further clarified on a request made by the Karnataka Government is also binding on everybody, namely, Anhdra Pradesh has a right to use the remaining water in excess of allocations made to the different States, Otherwise it will go waste tu the sea. Therefore, there is no dispute ot whatoever nature as far as this aspect is concerned. Thirdly, Sir, a hypothetical case was raised that once theie is t review in 2,000 AD after 31st May. if there is surplus water, there is a particular way of sharing. And I wll give the details, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Not nowi .

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I wilt give in just one sentence. If the water is 2.13Q TMC, then Andhra Pradesh's share will be 15, Karnataka's will be 50, and Maharashtra's will be 35. Suppose, it is more than 2,131 and upto 2,390 TMC because, Sir, all the three States, when they put the claims, they had said one point which is very important. Karnataka had said, to the best of my memory, 2397 as the flow of water. Maharashtra had said, 2392 as the flow of water. Of all these three, Andhra Pradesh was a little conservative, they had only said 2387. But Bachhawat himself, the Bachhawat award itself, after having taken 70 years flow, Sir in these 70 years very interesting things are there, it was taken from 1894-95 to 1958.59, into account, in this there were very interesting things. In 1956-57, the flow was 4165 TMC and in 1918-19 the flow was 1007 TMC. This is the one which made the Karnataka Government seek the clarification. Therefore, my point is that even assuming only for hypothesis, I am not going into the n*rits or demerits of this particular thing, since Mr. Hanumanthappa has said in 2000 A.D., when theie is 0 review, if there is excess water and if that water is distributed. Andhra Pradesh will get only 25 per cent. And this is what, in a way, Mr. Bachhawat has said. There is no doubt about i!. I am not denying it. I am not agreeing to it. I am only giving it as a hypothetical case. Sir, 2390 TMC is the dependable water flow as per Bachhawat, after havfne taken 78 years into consideration.

*That* mean* there will be water. 1 am rteiiy certain about it. We have shown ter the Union Government by giving the l'^w at four points consecutively, name!.y, at Jurala, al Srisalem, at Nagarjuna Sagar and Vijayawada that there is excess water, which is flowing into the river becaause . they wanted. Therefore, if 2390 is taken hypothetically and if 2060 is the present allotment if there is an excess of 330 TMC and if only 25 per cent comes to Andhra Piadesh, even then it will be 85. What we are using is onjy 29 TMC water. Therefore, from even his point of view, I am not conceding it, T am only arguing on his own behalf, there is 110 problem about that.

Then, 'he third question which he raised is that Rs. 637 crores are being spent and is it not a waste? Sir, in a year linke 1918-19, when the flow is only 1007 and dtebn since Bachhawat himself has said, tlie State which is to suffer, is Andhra Pradesh, in that year not only Rs. 637 crores but more than rupees three or *ft*ur thousand crores which have been spent on all the projects may also be useless. Therefore, there is no argument that in a particular year there may not be water flow, and therefore why do you spend more money? Therefore. Sir, even on that count, this argument tbat you are spending Rs. 637 crores or Rs. 843 crores also >s not valid because it is s> risk which any State has to take for the welfare of its people.

Sir, I have given the answers as per 'tlie Bachhawat Award itself. Even some of the points raised by them both realistically as well as hypothetically, have been answered by me. In view of this I would like to ask the Minister, what ft the difficulty? What is the point even in not accepting a proposal like that of Mr. Kalp Nath Rai that the three Chief Ministers have to be go together. Sir. this was even considered by Bachhawat himself while propounding scheme B. While considering scheme B he considered this aspect and ultimately Bachhawat Committee came to the conclusion that it is not feasible, there is no point iir having all the three States involved in this and liming a Krishna Valley Development Authority, which waas also found to be impracticable. Therefore, they came to scheme A and it has come into exigence from tbe date the Bachhawat Award was published. Therefore, Sir, I would like to request the Minister, Shri Shankaranand, as stated by Mr. Kalp Nath Rai, he is a very nice man, a reasonable man, he wants to do justice to the country, 1 do admit that, and in order to do that justice, that in the national ' interest he should come forward and say, look Karnataka Government people, Maharashtra Government psopie, what you are saying is not contravened by what has been claimed by Andhra Pradesh. Therefore, we will permit Andhra Pradesh. *(Interruptions)*. Therefore, I plead with him that he should immediately go ahead and give his clearance so that tomorrow "tbe generations of people, especially those which are suffering in the Rayalaseema District, they will thank him, they will remember him. Otherwise, the parched . lands of Rayalaseema will ever remain a testimony ior the incompetence shown by a set of peoole, if it becomes a desert. I do not want that to happen and I therefore plead with the Union Irrigation Minister to give this clearance,

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have heard the hon. Members, both from Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka with regard to the cle?rance of the Telugu Ganga Project. Of course, the deoale has been going on both within lh» PJ'liament and outside for the last many Javs—in; both the Houses. There was Tlalf-an-hour discussion in Lok Sabha also snd views were expressed.

One thing [ want to tell to the hon. Member. May be, Governments of Karnataka anil Maharashtra have objection* to the cleamr.ee of Telugu Ganga, *h**. them not presume that Central Government has also objections against this

[Shri B. Shankaranand^]

Teiegu-Ganga, otherwise a!l the fallacies and arguments on the wrong track and ether tilings wl! creep in, emotions wil; play and we will leave the track and go stray. At least I myself do not want to be led astray by emotions, I want to *be* very prag'rmtic and practical. As is *vftifi* known even in the words of the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh who has thanked me publicly saying that I hav$_e$ taken efforts to go to him twice *on* Telugu Gac^a and he was never doubtful about the sincerity and honest efforts of the Government of India as far as finding out a solution is concerned. But, let us not forget one thing In the heat of our discussions about Telugu Ganga the House should not forget the real ism: nnd ito is ihe problem of drinkim: water for Madras. As a matter of fact, it. was at the initative of the late Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi tbat the Krishna Basin States cf Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh agreed to spare 5 TMC each of Krishna water for drinking water to Madras city and there was an agreement in 1976. This was at the initiative ol the late Prime Minister. Now w; are in $^{1fi}$S6 Ten precious years have been lost and. still Madras—poor Madias —is not finding any water. These three States agreed and it was one of the brilliant example of inter-State co-operation which the States of this country showed to the world that they are willing and able to solve their own problems—the inter State problems. That was the example. This agreement came into beice and (his was mainly for drinking wffier Krishna water—15 TMC~was tc be for drinking. In the 1977 agreement. Government of India was a party to it. It was Mr. lagjivan Ram who took the initiative and the Government of India were assigned the role of monitoring this project of desires water and as if as then envisaged under from Sri Sailam was to be taken in Madras and the capacity and the type of channel were all determinated. The purpose, the period, were all determined. Unfortuna'ely. the element of irrigation was introduced. I do not say, it i< right or worng. T am not going to say whelher the Andhra Pradesh Government is rfr>rtt or worng in asserting their right of utilising their own water within thenterritory. I am not going to deal with this point because this will unnecessarily lead to controvesies and this is not going to help us in finding a solution. But it is the introduction of the element of irrigation which delayed the implementation of drinking water project for Madras city. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Can I just interrupt you for half a mirtute on this point?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I will complete and then you can ask.

The Chief Minister, the then Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, reserved his right and said that subject to this condition, h$_e$ would agree. After 1976, till 1983, six years went by and nothing happened. Absolutely nothing. It was only in 1983 that the Governments of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh came together. Came together for what? For laying the foundation-stone, about 150 or 160 kms. away from Srisailam. The offtake point was selected and the foundation-stone was laid. Both the Chief Ministers of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh were present. Of course, this was for a project. But the House should ponder over the question why six years were lost.

SHRI P. BABUL REDDY: It was Congrees Government then.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Anyhow, we cannot answer for that.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We came in 1983.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: If I make comments on these statements of yours, it will not lead us to any solution.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We are making factual statements.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am also making factual statements. Pleas© have patience and listen to me. In 1983

the foundation-stone was laid, at Chinnamukkapaplli about 160 kms. away from Srisailam. The expectation was that the off-take point would be near about Srisailam reservoir and not 160 kms. away. As I said, I am not going into the merits or demerits of the case. Hon. Members have referred to the reports in the Press and the pictures in the Press. They may speak about the knowledge of somebody doing some activity in the field of water resource development. I do not deny these Press reports or th$_e$ Press photographs. But 1 cannot base my judgement on these Press reports. For any Government, whether it is the State Government or the Central Government, the consideration would be on the basis of the facts on record. Somebody said that the Karnataka Chief Minister welcomed this. I am not going to be impressed or carried away by what he has said. I have nothing to say on what he has said or what he is alleged to have said. I have the objection from the Karnataka Government. They have said that we cannot clear the Telugu Ganga project. They have given various reasons. Sir, the House should ponder, whether the Government of India should go by the records they have, whether they should go by the objection they have received from the Karnataka Government or they should go by Press statements and photographs in the Press to which the hon. Memebers have referred.

Maharashtra Government has also raised objections. Maharashtra Government has gone to tlie extent of saying that if Andhra Pradesh has ratified subject to a certain condition, then there is no agreement at all and no action could be taken because there is no agreement. So, they say that Telugu-Ganga project should not be allowed. Now these are the objections given by the State Governments. Of] course, the objections are not from the Central Government. The objections are before the Central Government and thereby the two States which were parties to the Krishna Water Dispute Tribunal...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA : It would be better if you say that the dispute was firsl and then the award.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Let ni not go into the legal battle.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: That is very important. We cannot escape from that.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I do not know whether the hon. Members is a lawyer or not.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: No, he is a professor.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: That is why he is mistaking law for teaching. I know law and that is what 1 said.

SHRI PARVATHANENl UPENDRA: Lawyer can always twist facts.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I do no' know whether he is a lawyer.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: 1 am not a lawyer.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I know law to a certain extent.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: A lawyer can always argue a bad case effectively.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Any case is a good case for a lawyer. I am here as a Union Minister of Water Resources. I represent not particular interest, I am representing the interest of the nation. I belong to a party which repressnts the interest of the nation. I do not belong to a regional party. My interest is the national interest.

SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHAKRISHNA (Andhra Pradesh): Do you think the regional parties do not have interest.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt.

SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHAKRISHNA: We want to make it clear that we also represent the national interest?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Why are you agitating?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We are proud of belonging to a regional party.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Regional party with a national outlook- You must know this. Yours is also a regional party of Hindi belt.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Why are you offended when I said that I do rot I belong to a regional party.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We are not offended. We want to make it clear that we belong to a regional party with much more avowed national interest. Tbat has to be stressed there.

SHRi B. SHANKARANAND: Regional parties should not teach lessons to national party.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Nobody should teach lessons. I am proud of belonging to the Telugu Desam Party which is a regional party.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I did not take the name of the Telugu Desam party. Why are you getting offended?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Let us come to the facts.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND. Fortunately, water is national in its character because it flows from State to State. It ts a one binding force :.n this country which crosses from State to State. I am happy that the Krishna is an inter-State river, a national river. I do not want to quote figures because figures have been quoted from both the sides, whether it. is the water, the year, but one thing I should like to say is that the Bachawat Award gives the right to Andhra Pradesh to use the remaining water after having allotted or allocation.....

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: In excess of allocation. *(Interruptions').* I am only quoting Bachawat.

, SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am not arguing a case against Andhra Pradesh. If you are under the impression, please correct yourself. I am here to help all the States so that an early solution is found and people in Rayalaseema and other places—wherever they are starving for want of water, even drinking water—get water. Perhaps the House is aware that thi* year is the worst drought year for the country. It has been there in Krishna basin, particularly in the districts bordering Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. The rabiall deficit is also quite substantial in the Cauvery basin, in Tapti basin, in Dhulia district of Maharashtra, in Godavari bas\j, particularly upper reaches, in Chambal baain of Madhya Pradesh and also in Saurashtra in Sabarmati basin of Gujarat. Of all the States, Karnataka is the worst affected because there has been severe deficit of water in both ihe basins—Cauvery and Krishna. Almost the entire Karnataka is suffering. Let us not close our eyes. People want water. On the one hand water is going to the sea and on the other people are not having water—even drinking water, leave alone water for irrigation. I do agree that India cannot afford to waste water going to the sea. If Krishna water is going to the sea it must be stopped. We must use Krishna water for the benefit of the people. Then what are we doing? We in the Centre have been trying to persuade the three Chief Ministers to come to a table and find solution and come to an agreed task so that people get water. I want myself to Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister. Unfortunately, the Chief Minister, though I invited him personally, found it neither necessary nor desirable to talk with other Chief Ministers. Those are facts I am telling.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: He was not in favour of a joint meeting when you met him. He is prepared to meet you, if necessary, $h_e$ is prepared to meet the Prime Minister. If you want any clarification he can give. Why do you make it as a dispute with the other Chief Ministers who should come together to solve it? We are not prepared to accept it as a dispute.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I do not know why my hon. friends want" to shut their eyes to the objections raised by Maharashtra and Karnataka. If one Chief Minister says there is no dispute and two Chief Ministers say there is a dispute....

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Let the Centre decide.

SHRl B. SHANKARANAND: The Centre decided to invite the Chief Ministers to come to the table. But in his wisdom the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh thought it neither desirable nor necessary. Is it not necessary to find a solution to Telugu-Ganga? Is it not desirable to find a solution to Tclugu-Ganga? In whose interest are you demanding Telugu-Ganga? It is for thfe neople who are suffering. I»

it not jn the interest of suffering people of Andhra Pradesh that you should come together and find a solution?

SHRI PARATHANENI UPENDRA: Not a joint meeting.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: What of it? When two States have raised objection, why do you refuse?

SHRI PARVATHANENl UPENDRA: You want them to quarrel at the table?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Let him continue.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We have reitreated the position. You give your observations. It is for the Centre to clarify.

SHRI B. SHANKARNANAD: My friend, there is no legal provision existing today in this country under the Constitution or under any speifk law under the Constitution that the Central Government should take a legal decision in such disputes. That is the reason why we are persuading ali the States to come to talks. If there was any such law, as suggested by Shri Kalpnath Rai - and I wish there had been a law — we would not have hesitated to take a decision in the national interest. Let us not stretch our hands too far and create controversy. I feel very sorry that a precious national resource is being wasted. And for what Simple because of refusal to come to talk with the other Chief Ministers. We can find a solution; it is not difficult to find a solution. Telugu Ganga can find a solution. But there are certain considerations which all the Chief Ministers should agree to. If they are quoting from the Bachawat Award, I too can quote something from the Bachawat Award which says that "Better and fuller utilization of Krishna waters can be done if Scheme 'B' comes into existence."

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I think you will have to go into all the details and tell the House. Otherwise don't pick up something else and tell the House about Scheme 'B'.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: it was abondoned.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND; I think ihe honourable Member should first learn how to listen. This is colume 2 of the Bachawat Award—page 189, Chapter XIV. Part II. The Tribunal says:—

"We have discussed the projects for which demands have been made out of the dependable flow in column 6 of the above table in Part I of this chapter. We have allocated 800 TMC $a_s$ detailed below to the State of Andhra Pradesh as its share in the dependable flow of 2,060 TMC:

| | |
|---|---|
| Protected use | .. 749.16 TMC |
| Srisailam Project | .. 33.00 TMC |
| Jorala Project Stage I | 17.84 TMC |
| Total | .. 800.00 TMC |

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: That is actually evaporation. -

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am reading.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is reading as in the book.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Please do not put what is in your head. I am reading cold print.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You read (he explanation also which is there.

SHRl B. SHANKARANAND: Now, S00 TMC is the protected utilization ol Andhra Pradesh. In the final award the Bachawat Commission has allocated 808 TMC to Andhra Pradesh. All this 800 TMC has been committed. Now, for the Telugu Ganga project they want 29 TMC more. From where do they get it? Naluially Karnataka and Maharashtra have objected. All the allocation that fa given to Andhra Pradesh has been committed. If they want more water they should show from where.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Surplus water.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: It is Andhra Pradesh. ..*(Interruptions).*

SHRl B. SHANKARANAND: Listen, dear Professor, listen. Sir, the protected utilization at the time of the Tribunal is 749.16 TMC. Evaporation loss in tha Srisailam reservoir is 33 TMC. It comes to 782.16 TMC. Now five TMC is spared for Madras. In 1981, the Srisailam right bank canal project has been sanctioned and there they have to get 19 TMC. Jurala irrigation project, under consideration, 17.84 TMC; Telugu Ganga project, under consideration, 29 TMC. The total comes to 853 TMC. The water allocated under the Bachawat award is 800 TMC. Now, naturally Karnataka and Maharashtra will say, from where will *you* get 53 TMC? Unless Andhra Pradesh says this is where we are getting these 53 TMC and the Centre Government need not object to this or Maharashtra and Karnataka need not object because there is the 53 TMC of water and we are going ahead with the Telugu Ganga project . . .

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Minister, the Bachawat Commission Itself has estimated it as 2390 TMC on the average of 75 per cent dependability.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am coming to the Bachawat Award.

SHRI P. BABUL REDDY: Yon should not argue.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am just telling you which way you should go. Otherwise, you will miss it. It is my signal to you. Tread the right path so that you can achieve the objective. Don't go by the wrong way.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We want clearance. You show the path.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: That i* what I say. If at all you want to get water, the only way is to appoint » Krishna River Authority.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: How can we do it now?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: And implement the Scheme B. The Scheme B has got the only solution to give you more water. Now, if Andhra Pradesh is willing to accept this, and they should be if at all they are interested in the Telugu Ganga, this can be done. Otherwise, if you object to the appointment of the River Authority, the question of implementation of the Scheme B does nol. arise. Then, if you want to stick finally to the award of the Bachawat Committee, 800 TMC of water has been allocated to you. You would get not a drop more.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Each time you are missing.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Listen. I am not going to listen to you now. Yoa wait and listen. After I finish, you say whatever you want to say.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You are side-tracking the issue.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am not here to speak to please anybody here in the House, but only to tell the facts.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Please state the facts fully, not partially.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, now, may I tell that in 1983 how this Telugu Ganga Project was prepared? That Project was prepared in a hurry. Do you know how it was prepared? It is a project, I should say, Sir, which is not a small project. It is a project which has 400 km. of canal.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: It is 386 km.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: About 400.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Nobody raised that point.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Let the House know how big the Project is.

SHRI P. BABUL REDDY: Nobody talked about hasty preparation of the project etc. I dont want you to add to tbe dispute.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Mr. Reddy, I am willing to help every State including Andhra Pradesh. For an early clearance, all the issues that are involved for clearance of the Project should be resolved.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: By then the Project will be completed?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: That is the attitude that is creating the problem.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is not a problem; it $j_s$ a fact. If you take a hundred years, we cannot wait.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We cannot make people starve there.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Government of India wiH not allow any thought which will weaken this country as far as national integration and unity is concerned.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We are for national integration, unitfr and -sttengfh.

SHRI>N^HANKARANAND: Government of India under the leadership of our Prime Mi lister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, will not allow...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: What?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: ...any thought which will weaken the fibre of unity of this country.

SHRI PARVATHANENl UPENDRA: Who is having that thought?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Under the leadership of Shri N. T. Rama Rao we stand for unity, integrity and strength, and we wiH not allow anybody to tamper with that.

SHRT PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: let it be on record.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: In the beginning there were incomplete surveys for canal alignment, inadequate surveys for the three balancing reservoirs, incomplete geological investigations and foundation investigations with respect to the canal strata, canal structure, the dam structure and the balancing reservoirs. The Project Report also lacks in the supporting data to establish the water availability for irrigation.. *{Interruptions)*

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA- The hon. Minister will excuse me, these were the question raised and answer were given. Obviously, if the answers were given, then...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him complete it.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: 1 am *pointing this out because* going into this is not solving the problem. Already answers have been given for ihese. Information has been given. There is full information with you now. Even if it was prepared in haste, as you say, but there is no haste...

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Professor, listen to me.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: L am listening, but I am putting the records straight.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND- But you have the habit of speaking at the time when you should be listening. We don't have. The Hon. Member made the case saying all the information that was necessary is before the Government of India. May I tell the hon. Members from Andhra Pradesh that cither they are not properly briefed or—I do not say they are deliberately suppressing, because that would be an allegation—perhaps fru-v do not know the facts.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Let *ir* 1 the facts.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Then listen.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I know tening.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: There are a few aspects which are yet to be accepted by the Central Water Commission. I am talking of the technoeconomic viability I am not now referring to the inter-State aspect.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA- I know that.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, will you ask the hon. Professor to listen to me?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: The Central Power Commission has not accepted...

MR. DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: You should not raise this kind of interruptions wheh we are running short of time. Please cooperate and see that the Minister completes his speech.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: But at the same time we cannot allow half ttuUi.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: .And you must allow us to clarify.-

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: May I inform the hon. Member that he is not in the Chair. I don't want his permission to speak here and he says he wil! not allow.

MR. DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The Minister will lose his objectivity which is not proper. So, let us not argue more. Please proceed.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: For such a big project there are three important aspects to be satisfied before it is cleared. One is the technical requirement. Second is the economic viability. The third and the most important is the availability of water. These are the three basic requirements to be satisfied by tlie CWC and the Technical Advisory Committee of the Planning Commission before tlie project is cleared. In regard to the technical aspect, apart from the dam design, the gate design, canal design and plant planning, I may inform that we have cleared all these in December. There are some aspects yet to be accepted and they are under examination. I will tell you when they are received in our office. Water availability of Krishna and at Pennar for irrigation is to be established. The question of Spill-way designs of dams, of balancing the reservoirs is there. There are^three reservoirs. Because it is a long canal with three balancing reservoirs, irrigation planning aspects, cost estimates and cost-benefit ratio, environmental clearance, the inter-State aspect with reference to this are to be looked inlo. Now, except the spiH-way designs, the geological report of Kandalvetu reservoir water availability study of Pennar wt have received all information. We do not say we have not received the information, but may I tell the hon. Members, the most important technical information is still awaited. Please note this down. The Government of Andhra Pradesh has not yet sent the spill way designs of the balancing reservoirs. Sir, I am sorry these have been received by us only on the 3rd March, 1986. Today it is the 6th March.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: When was this point raised? That is also a very important point.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND- The spill way designs of three balancing reservoirs are very important for carrying the water.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA. Does it constitute part of the first question?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, will you please ask the hon. Member to keep quite?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't interrupt when the Minister is replying.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, the information is still awaited with regard to the geological report of Kandalvelu reservoir and the drawing of head regulator for Velugudu reservoir. These are the technical reports in any project to be cleared. Even information is not available with us. Besides this, the costs have been estimated by the Government of Andhra Pradesh only a month ago. We have received the revised costs and they run into.....

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA- From Rs. 637 to Rs. 843 crores.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: On what basis the costs have been revised? When the information is not complete before the Central Water Commission how can we proceed ahead. On one side there is no information and on the other costs are being revised. How do you arrive at the cost estimate Benefit cost ration in the absence of the information?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: If you delay further it will run into thousands of crores of rupees.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I am sorry to say that the Government of Andhra Pradesh is delaying. I do not know for what reasons?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We are very keen about this project.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: If you are keen then why the Government of Andhra Pradesh is delaying? Why not all the Chief Ministers sit toge:her and resolve their problems amicably. What is preventing the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh from coming to the table.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: There is no reason why the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh should come to the tn I

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Then why your Chief Minister is not coming to the table. Sir, I do not think they have raised any valid points except saying that the Minister should quit or resign or leave this portfolio. These accusations are not going to solve any issue or help in finding any solution.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You need not dilate upon them.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: You said about this earlier. Again today you have repeated here in this House.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I did not make any new points.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I do not think it was necessary to mention these things here.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: If you are hurt by my remarks, then, I am sorry.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, I am proud that I belong to Karnataka.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: There is nothing wrong in that.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND- T don't hide my Membership.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: We got more love towards Karnataka and we are prepared to do anything for that State.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, we have been discussing this .subject both in this House and in the other House, but no concrete solution has been suggested by any hon. Member except saying that it should be cleared. Sir, on what basis it should be cleared?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Basis also we told you again and again.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Repetition of Bachawat Award is not the basis. On the basis of the Bachawat Award only, objections have been raised.

SHRl PARVATHANENl; The basis is the Bachawat Award.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, my hon. friends are supporting my stand here. They have been saying about the provisions of the Bachawat award. They have heen saying that the objections of Maharashtra, and Karnataka should not navi been there. Why should not their Chief Minister come and say the same thing befcie the other Chief Ministers?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: For that, your good offices are no! needed. If they want to meet, they can meet and settle it themselves. *(InerrupUons)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you are going to interrupt at every stage, then the House will have to sit till midnight or tomorrow morning.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: May I tell him that this is not a class-room.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA- I do not treat it as a class-room.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Please listen and learn. I am sorry to say that. It is no disrespect to you because every professor is a student throughout his life.

SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHA-KRISHNA: Let the Minister address the Chair. He is indulging in arguments with-the Members and so controversy arises. Let him address the Chair and give his reply. There ends the matter.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, I do not want to waste the time of the House. I still say that I am very keen to

(Shri B. Shankaranand)

solve the issues. Let us meet together. We will find water. There is no problem. But for that, the needs and requirements of all the States, their future-water resource development and all the programmes of the States in view of the Krishna award and the Godavari award, have Io be considered together. And above all, today the need is more for Madras city for drinking water. Let us try to find out a solution. Let us not stand on issues of prestige. We should not pose as if we are only interested in a particular area. I doi not think any Chief Minister is interested in a particular area. I do not presume that, livery Chief Minister has the interest of his State and the national interest in his mind. May I appeal to the three Chief Ministers, including the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, may I appeal to the three Governments: don't make it a prestige issue; don't make it any other issu? but an issue of national requirement to find water for ihe needy. I am quite hopeful'of finding a solution. I assure the House that we will leave no stone unturned in finding a solution for the people of Rayalaseema. Sir, there will be many revealing things if I say them here. If you go through the Krishna award, in the requirements put before the Bachawat Commission, the demands of Rayalaseema did not find a place.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA; That is what we have also been saying. The then Congress Government did no: bother about the interests of Rayalaseema.

SHRI B- SHANKARANAND: If that ts the case, should not the Andhra Pradesh Government think x>f redistributing their own waters, saving water somewhere and diverting it to Rayalaseema?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That also we are thinking—diverting water from Godavari.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: If this is their love for Ravalaseema, there are to be a specific project for saving water....

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: For that, the Polavaram project is also talking with you. The project for carrying water from Godavari and Krishna is lying with you.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: ...from somewhere anti giving it to Rayalseema. Till this dispute is settled, should they not do that? *[Interruptions)* The honest efforts of the Andhra Pradesh Government in saving water where water is in excess and using it for Rayalseema will be very much appreciated, till the dispute is settled. But we do not want to pick holes. But please come to a settlement.

And. Sir, let us that he go out.....I hope the House agrees. Thank you,....

## ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT LEGISLATIVE AND OTHER BUSINESS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Member that the .....Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the .....1986. allotted time lor Government legislative and other business as follows:—

Discussion on the Resolution seeking disapproval of the Administrative Tribunals (Amendment) Ordinance, 1986 and consideration and passing of the Administrative Tribunal (Amendment) Bill, 1986:

The Committee recommended that the discussion on the Railway Budget for 1986-87 shou'd conclude on Monday, the 10th March. 1986 and the Minister would reply to the debate on Tuesday, the llth March, 1986.

The Committee allotted four days, i.e. March 11, 12. 13 and 17, 1986 for discussion on the General Budget for 1986-87.

The Committee also recommended that the House should dispense with the lunch hour on the days on which the General Budget for 1986-87 is discussed in the House.

The House now stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow the 7th March, 1986.

The House tim adjourned at fifty-six minutes pas*, seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 7th March, 1986.